

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are pending in the present application. Claim 1-29 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a).

The Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough examination of the subject application and respectfully requests reconsideration of the subject application based on the following remarks.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTIONS

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-29 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,134,432 to Holmes, et al. ("Holmes" or the "Holmes Reference") in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,658,260 to Knotts, et al. ("Knotts" or the "Knotts Reference") further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0049817 to Drory, et al. ("Drory" or the "Drory Reference"). The Applicant respectfully traverses the grounds for rejection for the reasons provided below.

The shortcomings of the Holmes reference were addressed in our previous response, which are incorporated herein by reference. The Examiner admits that Holmes does not disclose that the personal communication carriers operate using a plurality of air interface protocols and that the network operator provides a plurality of wireless applications. With respect to the former non-disclosure, the Examiner asserts that Knotts teaches an inter-carrier short messaging service center interface that enables communication between one or more personal communication system carriers using multiple air interface protocols. With respect to the latter non-disclosure, the Examiner asserts that Drory teaches an application aggregator that enables providing a plurality of wireless applications to a plurality of users.

The Knotts reference issued on December 2, 2003 and was based on a provisional application filed on September 5, 2001. The Applicant respectfully swears

S. Dye
U.S.S.N. 10/044,834
Page 11

behind this reference. A Declaration Under 37 CFR 1.131 is attached hereto. Because neither the Holmes reference nor the Drory reference teach an inter-carrier short messaging service center interface that enables communication between one or more personal communication system carriers using multiple air interface protocols as recited in claims 1, 12, 20, and 25, the Applicant believes that the Examiner's ground for rejection is inappropriate.


Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that, the claims 1-29 are not made obvious by the Holmes references in view of Knotts and Drory, and further, satisfy all of the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 100, et seq., especially § 103(a). Accordingly, claims 1-29 are allowable. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is requested.

The Applicant believes that no further fees are required. However, if for any reason a fee paid is inadequate or credit is owed for any excess fee paid, you are hereby authorized and requested to charge or credit Deposit Account No. **04-1105**.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 20, 2004

By: _____


George W. Hartnell, III
Reg. No. 42,639
Attorney for Applicant(s)

EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, MA 02205
(617) 517-5523
Customer No.: 21,874
430311v2